

**To:** McQueen, Jacqueline[McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov]  
**From:** Walt Sanders  
**Sent:** Thur 12/17/2015 7:17:46 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Question

I find it interesting that this letter has attracted so much attention from the industry. EVERYTHING is on hold until they see how EPA responds. Thanks for keeping on top of this.

**From:** McQueen, Jacqueline [mailto:McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2015 2:15 PM  
**To:** Walt Sanders  
**Subject:** RE: Question

Hello, Walt. I'm checking to see if there has been any progress since yesterday afternoon. As of yesterday, the EPA response was still with our congressional office, but they were hopeful that it would be sent this week. If I hear anything more today, I will let you know.

I realize that it has been a long time, and that the letter is behind schedule.

Jackie

**From:** Walt Sanders [mailto:wsanders@vmgthehill.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2015 2:03 PM  
**To:** McQueen, Jacqueline <McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Question

Dear Jackie,

I hope you are doing well.

Any progress on the response to the Energy and Commerce Committee?

Walt

**From:** McQueen, Jacqueline [<mailto:McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 05, 2015 4:55 PM  
**To:** Walt Sanders  
**Subject:** RE: Question

When we have a signed, final letter, I can provide it. We have a one week extension to 11/13.

**From:** Walt Sanders [<mailto:wsanders@vmgthehill.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 05, 2015 4:50 PM  
**To:** McQueen, Jacqueline <[McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov](mailto:McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Question

Would it be possible for me to receive a copy of the EPA response to the Committee letter? If so, who should I ask?

**From:** McQueen, Jacqueline [<mailto:McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 30, 2015 7:54 AM  
**To:** Rom Reddy  
**Cc:** Walt Sanders  
**Subject:** RE: Question

Hi Rom and thanks.

What I am trying to determine is whether this is a voluntary standard or not. On the Synthetic

Turf Council website, there is a document dated August 2015 that discusses the standard for metals. It uses the words “suggested” and “voluntary.” Is this accurate? I want to make sure I am characterizing this correctly. Thanks.

Jackie

Jacqueline McQueen  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (8104R)  
Office of Research and Development  
Office of Science Policy  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20460  
(202) 564-6639

**From:** Rom Reddy [<mailto:romreddy@sprinturf.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 4:09 PM  
**To:** McQueen, Jacqueline <[McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov](mailto:McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Walt Sanders <[wsanders@vmgthehill.com](mailto:wsanders@vmgthehill.com)>  
**Subject:** Question

Jackie, my name is Rom Reddy and I am the Managing Partner of Sprinturf—one of the 3 member Safe Field Alliance team. I have attached a test done by Labosport, a world renowned lab that does all the tests for FIFA. As u can see from the test, the values compare the test for crumb rubber vs the very stringent European Union Toy standard. The US toy standard specifies a 100 ppm limit for one of the heavy metals---lead that has received the most attention. However, all the other heavy metals that are less critical than lead also test less than 100 ppm. If u combine the lead levels in the green blades and the lead levels in crumb rubber, they both test less than 100 ppm. Ditto for other heavy metals. The EPA guideline for these metals in urban soils is 400ppm. Hope this provides some clarity. These tests are duplicated by almost any other certified lab.

Rom Reddy